



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

THE ADVOCATE OF PEACE.

VOL. LVIII.

BOSTON, DECEMBER, 1896.

No. 11

THE AMERICAN PEACE SOCIETY,
PUBLISHERS,
NO. 3 SOMERSET STREET, BOSTON, MASS.

CONTENTS.

	PAGE
EDITORIALS.	269—273
The Venezuela Arbitration — The Teaching of War in History Text-Books — Peace in the South — European Diplomatic Duplicity.	
EDITORIAL NOTES	273—277
Holiday Greetings — Thanksgiving — Foreign Policy of President McKinley — Institute of International Law — <i>Monatliche Friedens-Correspondenz</i> — E. T. Moneta — Letter of John Wesley — Björnstjerne Björnson — Exeter Friends of Peace — Football in University of Texas — Cost of U. S. Army.	
Correspondence with State Department	277
Military Men and War, <i>General Türr</i>	277
An Essay towards the Present and Future Peace of Europe, <i>William Penn.</i>	280
Press Comments on the Agreement to refer the Venezuela Question to Arbitration	283—285
New Books, <i>The Wampum Belt</i>	286
Ian Maclaren as a Messenger of Peace and Good Will.	286

THE VENEZUELA ARBITRATION.

It is just a year ago the 17th of this month that President Cleveland's Venezuela message set all Anglo-Saxondom in commotion. Everybody is delighted that the last breezes of the commotion have disappeared with the announcement in London and Washington on the 9th and 10th of November that a basis of settlement of the trouble has been reached. This announcement was first made by Lord Salisbury at the Lord Mayor's banquet in London on Nov. 9. The next day the State Department at Washington confirmed the statement, and gave to the press two letters which were withheld at the time of the publication of the diplomatic correspondence in July last.

From these letters it appears that the trouble to be removed was Lord Salisbury's objection to turning over the question of the "settled districts" in the disputed region to unrestricted arbitration, as Mr. Olney had insisted

should be done. In his letter dated July 3, 1896, he explained what he had not made entirely clear in his former dispatches, that he did not mean that these "settled districts" should fall to Great Britain simply because they were excluded from the arbitration, but that they should be treated as a separate subject and disposed of by further negotiation. "The claim of Venezuela is so far reaching," he says, "that it brings into question interests and rights which can not properly be disposed of by an unrestricted arbitration. It extends as far as the Essequibo; it covers two-thirds of the colony of British Guiana; it impeaches titles which have been unquestioned for many generations. These districts must be treated separately, and until further inquiry has thrown more light upon the matter it is only by reserving the settled districts generally that this can be done."

In Mr. Olney's reply, dated July 13, after disposing of minor points in Salisbury's dispatch, he says: "That Venezuela claims territory extending to the Essequibo, or covering two-thirds of the colony of British Guiana, cannot be regarded as being of itself an insuperable obstacle to unrestricted arbitration. But the objection that the Venezuelan claim 'impeaches titles which have been unquestioned for many generations' is undoubtedly of the most weighty character. The inquiry I desire to put, therefore, is this: 'Can it be assumed that Her Majesty's government would submit to unrestricted arbitration the whole of the territory in dispute, provided it be a rule of the arbitration, embodied in the arbitral agreement, that territory which has been in the exclusive, notorious and actual use and occupation of either party for even two generations, or say for sixty years, shall be held by the arbitrators to be the territory of such party? In other words, will Her Majesty's government assent to unrestricted arbitration of all the territory in controversy with the period for the acquisition of title by prescription fixed by agreement of the parties in advance at sixty years?'"

This suggestion of Mr. Olney's gave the clue for the satisfactory basis which has been agreed upon for submitting the whole question to arbitration. Lord Salisbury at once accepted the method proposed as promising sufficient protection to actual British settlers in their

rights. He objected to the period of sixty years as being too long, but accepted the method in general.

The details of the treaty, which is understood to be entirely satisfactory to Venezuela, have, of course, not yet been officially made public. It has been drawn and signed by Pauncefote and Olney, and will go to the United States Senate and the British government for ratification, before publication. The London *Chronicle* for November 14th says that the agreement was signed on Nov. 12. The same paper, of the same date, gave what it claims is a complete summary of the agreement. This summary is probably essentially right, and is as follows:

A tribunal of five members is to be appointed, two to be named by the Supreme Court of the United States, two by that of Great Britain. These four are to select a jurist for the fifth member, who shall be the president of the tribunal, and may be taken from the Supreme Court of either nation. The tribunal is to examine all the facts necessary to decide the controversy regarding the territory belonging to the United Netherlands and to Spain when Great Britain acquired British Guiana. With regard to the settled districts a prescription of fifty years is provided. The ordinary rules of law are to prevail in the proceedings, and the arbitrators may give effect to the rights of settlers.

In view of this agreement, which practically gives the whole subject to arbitration, the Venezuela Commission at once announced that it would not attempt to make a report on the boundary question. It will, however, continue its work until it has tabulated and put into shape for future reference and use the valuable material which it has brought together. This material will be placed at the disposal of the tribunal of arbitration to be appointed, and no such tribunal will ever have begun its work with the ground better prepared for it in advance.

Both Lord Salisbury and Secretary Olney are to be congratulated on the happy termination to which they have brought a very difficult and delicate negotiation. And the people of both countries, the friends of justice and peace so numerous in both, are also to be congratulated for the way in which they have stood by and insisted that the negotiation should end as it ought to end. This has been one of the unique characteristics of this negotiation, that the people have made their voice heard in it, that they have been taken into the confidence and made the advisers of the Ministers. Lord Salisbury has done the best he could have done with a bad case. He has really won something for Great Britain, if not in securing any of the territory in dispute, at least in providing that the actual rights of British settlers shall not be subject to Venezuelan confiscation in case the decision is wholly against Great Britain. Secretary Olney has conducted the United States side of the negotiation with great ability and with the utmost satisfaction of his fellow-countrymen, but he has

done better than Lord Salisbury only because he had so much better a case to start with.

We are very glad to notice that, since the announcement of the agreement to arbitrate the case, there has been very little criticism of the English Minister on this side of the water for his past course in the matter. He is now considered by all of us a most excellent statesman. The general feeling of good will towards England has been greatly strengthened in this country, and we understand that English feeling toward the United States has also profited in the same way. This is one of the most beneficial results of the situation.

It is understood that the negotiation will be further pushed without delay for a general treaty of arbitration between the two countries. This negotiation has already gone so far that it would be very unfortunate to have it drop now. The Venezuela matter being out of the way, and the friendly feeling between the two countries being greater perhaps than it has ever before been, there certainly is no serious obstacle in the way of the immediate completion of a general treaty of arbitration which shall cover a very large number, if not all, of the serious differences which may hereafter arise between the two countries. The tone of the press and of public and private speech in both countries certainly indicates that the demand for such a treaty is even greater than the demand for the amicable settlement of the Venezuela question.

THE TEACHING OF WAR IN HISTORY TEXT-BOOKS.

Josiah W. Leeds, of Philadelphia, has just published a ten-page pamphlet entitled "Against the Teaching of War in History Text-Books." In the preface he quotes Principal James Currie, of the Church of Scotland Training School, as saying that "the *first reform* in the teaching as in the writing of school history should be to assign to the wars of a nation their true position and character, instead of measuring national prosperity or greatness exclusively by its war-like achievements. We should regard war in general as a divergence from the true course in a nation's history, both on moral and social grounds. The arts of peace, which have been almost overlooked, should be raised to the position of prominence hitherto assigned to those of war."

The pamphlet contains a number of very pertinent quotations and examples illustrating the baleful effects of this false teaching of history upon the young people of the country. For example, Rev. Alexander Mackay-Smith is quoted as saying: "Our children are nurtured on stories of British cruelty in the Revolutionary War; the devil, to them, has a red coat and carries a Queen Anne musket. My great-grandfather was an officer in that war, but I wish we could forget the whole conflict. My own children are growing up to dislike England because of that old war